

# THE GREEN BOOK



BY MUAMMAR AL QADHAFI

## PART 1

The solution of the problem of Democracy

## PART 2

The solution of the Economic Problem

## PART 3

The Social Basis of the Third Universal Theory

In these three volumes the Libyan leader examines the economic, social and political problems confronting the world today, and presents a radical programme for their solution.

The Green Book provides a comprehensive review of the theories on which the Libyan Jamahiriya is based. The proposals put forward by Muammer al Qadhafi are not merely theories but an explanation and insight into the structure and priorities of modern Libya.

Copies of The Green Book can be obtained from The Information Department, The Libyan People's Bureau of the Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 5 St James's Square, London SW1.

# jamahiriya review

OCTOBER 1980

Price 50p

WIDEN  
D.T. LC  
236  
J35  
X

JAMAHIRIYA SOLIDARITY  
CONFERENCE REPORT



SPECIAL REPORT

LIBYA AND SYRIA

## THE UNION



# ARAB DAWN REPORTS

Arab Dawn Reports is a series of pamphlets which focus on Libya's internal political and economic development and the Jamahiriya's role in international affairs. Other reports deal with pan-Arab and Palestinian affairs.

## REPRINT—JUST OUT

**ISRAEL AND TORTURE:** As a result of public demand this important special investigation by The Sunday Times 'Insight' team has now been reprinted. Read the facts about the harsh Zionist practices in the Arab territories under military occupation.

**PALESTINE AND THE CAMP DAVID ACCORDS:** An analysis by Palestinian historian Dr Fayez Sayegh of how the Camp David accords systematically avoid the central question in the Middle East, the position of the Palestinians; and an interview with leading Israeli civil rights activist Dr Israel Shahak on Israel's domination of occupied Palestine. Essential background to the debate on Camp David.

**DEMOCRACY IN INDUSTRY:** The takeover of factories by workers has been a feature of the changing Libyan economy. The ideas behind the move were spelt out by Colonel Qadhafi in his May Day address in 1978, and the text is reprinted in this pamphlet.

**THE GREEN BOOK:** Public discussions  
This report is based on the texts of two public discussions held in London to consider the Green Book by Colonel Muammer Qadhafi. Contributors include: John Cartwright MP, Andrew Faulds MP, David Watkins MP, Dr Timothy Niblock and Dr David Pool.

**LIBYAN OIL:** Two decades of challenge and change. Four essays tell the story of how Libya took on and defeated the multinational oil companies in order to win back its oil resources for the people of the Jamahiriya.

Copies of these reports are available without charge from:  
13a Hillgate Street, London W8

# jamahiriya review

Issue No 5

October 1980

**COVERY STORY:** The newly forged union between the Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria has far-reaching implications for both countries and the future of the Arab nationalist struggle in the region. In their approach to the merger, western commentators have varied from the hostile to the sceptical. Many, of course, openly wish to see the union fail. However, there are grounds to share the optimism expressed by the Libyan and Syrian people, as Phil Kelly explains on page 9. Vigorous efforts to provide secure foundations for the move are being taken to ensure that the scheme has the full backing and support of the citizens. A report on page 8 examines the steps towards this important merger of two Arab states. This month's editorial comment on page 4 looks at the unity scheme in an international and pan-Arab context.

**WITH THE** United States playing an increasingly assertive foreign policy role in the Middle East and surrounding areas, more than 156 organisations assembled in Tripoli during late August for an international conference to examine recent trends in American and Arab politics, and to express support for the Libyan Arab people now under increasing threats from the US and her client regimes in the region. On page 12, Louis Eaks examines the background to this important conference and the political resolutions adopted in Tripoli.

**A WARNING** of the increasing American pressure in the Arab homeland, coupled with a plea that Arab should not fight Arab came from Libya's revolutionary leader Muammer Qadhafi during September. Libya, he said, would not fight Egypt. Report on page 11.

**OIL PRODUCTION:** The meeting of OPEC ministers in Vienna during September saw the Libyan Foreign Secretary urging that prices must be regulated by production. On page 16 Phil Kelly reviews the significance of this recent meeting and assesses the past role of the Libyan Jamahiriya in transforming OPEC into a vehicle for Third World struggle towards a new economic order.

## EDITORIAL

Unity to protect human values and realise aspirations ..... 4

## PANORAMA NEWS REVIEW

Qadhafi calls for halt to Iran-Iraq war .....	5
US gets warning over territorial violations .....	5
Tunisian Premier to visit Libya .....	5
United Yemen to join the union? .....	5
Arab People's Congress backs unity moves .....	6
British Liberal Party leader calls for talks with PLO .....	6
Jamahiriya aids Islam in Korea .....	6
Churches increase aid to African guerrillas .....	6
Islamic states seek Israel's expulsion from UN .....	6
Arafat warns on Lebanon .....	7
Opposition to US bases in Oman and Somalia .....	7
Omar Mukhtar's martyrdom observed .....	7

## NEWS REPORTS AND FEATURES

Union agreed for Libya and Syria .....	8
Unity: What are the prospects? .....	9
Arab leaders welcome Libya's union moves .....	10
We will fight the United States but not the Arabs .....	11
American intrigues in Middle East a threat to Arab rights .....	12
Qadhafi warns of threat to 'Peace, progress and liberty' .....	13
The Tripoli Declaration: A Charter for Peace and Justice .....	14
US Presidential candidates put Zionist interests first .....	15

## TRADE AND ECONOMIC NEWS

Oil production the key to pricing .....	16
Arab oil revenues up, but value eroded .....	18
Pan Arab economic charter adopted .....	18
Decline in OPEC surplus forecast .....	18
Arab aid to Africa .....	18
US trade deficit with Arab states triples .....	18
Giant petro-chemicals complex opens .....	19
Oil exploration gathers momentum .....	19
Light industry production rises .....	19
Dramatic expansion in cement sector .....	19
New road construction projects .....	19

Published by Jamahiriya Review, 13A Hillgate Street, London W8 7SP. Telephone: 01-727 3131. Telex: 892830 Event G. Printed by W F Aldridge & Company Limited, London SW16 6NW. We acknowledge the co-operation of JANA, the Jamahiriya News Agency, in providing its daily news information bulletin.



## Unity to protect human values and realise aspirations

THE NEWLY announced union between the Syrian and Libyan peoples marks an important landmark at the start of the new decade, and for Muslims at the opening of a new century. It has been endorsed and supported throughout the Arab homeland, but the backing which the move initiated by Brother Muammer Qadhafi has received from the more conservative Arab states of the Gulf is not without significance. Once again it has been shown that American assessments of her allies in the Arab homeland are less than accurate, and Washington's belief that the Arab nation can be seduced into support for the Camp David process to legitimise the Zionist state in Palestine is nothing more than a mirage.

In this issue we give extended coverage to two subjects: firstly, the moves towards union between Syria and the Libyan Jamahiriya; secondly the threats posed against the Jamahiriya and the Arab revolutionary movement by American imperialism. The two issues are two sides of a single coin. They are so inter-related that they are virtually a single issue.

For the western peoples dependent on a less than impartial media, with its diplomatic phraseology intertwined with its devious and hostile goals of misrepresenting the Arab nation to the world beyond, the crisis looming in the Arab homeland may not be fully understood.

Yet that crisis exists, and the threats which make it a reality provided the additional motivation for the call, by Libya's revolutionary leader Muammer Qadhafi, for union between the Jamahiriya and Syria. Although the conflict which has erupted between Iraq and Iran has temporarily diverted international attention from the situation in the Arab homeland, the prospects of a new Middle East war grow by the day as the Zionists continue in their escalation of bombing raids over Lebanese territory. Inside occupied Palestine the increasing repression being exercised by the Zionist occupation forces against the Palestinian people also points to the Zionists' intention of staging a new aggression against the Arab peoples.

Added to this are the military and political provocations resulting from America's interventionist policy in the region. The Camp David accords, which created union between the Zionists and the Sadat regime subservient to American policies in the Middle East, have been followed on a military level with the establishment of new US bases in Oman and Somalia, and the strengthening of the American military presence in the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean. Both from the heart of the Arab homeland and from bases on its borders, the United States is laying the foundations of a scheme to strike at the Arab nationalist movement, to destabilise progressive Arab states and suppress the nationalist movements which stand as the expression of Arab aspirations.

So paranoid is the United States, along with certain western leaders, to maintain a global presence and influence, that

they feel it vital that regimes should be subservient to Washington's interests. They distort the legitimate aspirations of the Arab peoples, along with those throughout the Third World, to assert that a country which is not in some sort of a political and economic alliance with the United States must automatically be an agent of the Soviet Union. To support this assertion it is often pointed out that in conflict situations Soviet arms are used by national liberation movements. No one in the West stops to consider why nationalist movements should require Soviet military aid to confront dictatorships and oppressive regimes so adequately armed by the United States.


In the Middle East, Syria and Libya, it is true, acquire arms from the Soviet Union. But it was the United States which planted a settler Zionist regime in Palestine and armed it with military hardware to expel the Palestinian people from their homeland and launch aggressions against the Arab people. Any Soviet role in the Middle East, albeit only as an arms supplier, is merely a reaction to balance the American presence and influence in the region.

The American scheme is to weaken the Arab nation to such an extent that Washington can impose its hegemony on the Arab homeland with the minimum of resistance or opposition. While the western media plays its role in presenting the Arab people as aggressive, in effect it is the United States which has declared war on the Arab nation under the guise of 'securing her vital interests in the Middle East' — the euphemism for oil supplies. It might be assumed by rational and reasonable people that the United States and the Arabs should be able to co-exist on the basis of mutual respect for the other's territorial integrity. After all, the US along with other industrialised nations, has and controls certain items of 'vital interest' to the Arabs, namely technology. How would the western press react if the Arabs began a military campaign against Europe and the United States to secure and protect their access to that technology?


If the Arab nation is to withstand the challenge now posed by the United States and her client regimes in occupied Palestine and Egypt, there is no alternative to unity. Most important, the union between Syria and the Libyan Jamahiriya is being forged on the basis of the union of two peoples rather than two leaders or two governments. In this respect, the strength and the future prospects of the union lie in its mass popular base.

At the same time, the union must not be seen as purely a defensive pact. Very real and tangible economic and social benefits will materialise from the union to benefit the peoples of both regions, as well as the important contribution it will make to strengthening the nationalist Arab forces, not simply in confronting the enemy but also in achieving the goals of justice and progress in the Arab homeland. Against the background of past failures at union, the Libyan and Syrian people carry very grave responsibilities to ensure the success of the scheme and to provide an example to other Arab people.

A monthly  
review of  
Libyan, Islamic  
and Third World  
affairs



**PANORAMA**  
news review



### Qadhafi calls for halt to Iran-Iraq war

LIBYAN REVOLUTIONARY leader Colonel Muammer Qadhafi has sent telegrams to Ayatollah Khomeini and President Saddam Hussein of Iraq expressing his deep concern and regret at the fighting between the two Gulf states 'since it serves no one but United States and Israeli interests'. Lives were being wasted, he said, when they might have been used in the struggle to liberate Jerusalem.

The Libyan leader has also sent urgent messages to the heads of state of Muslim countries requesting their help in ending the fighting in the interests of Islamic unity.

### US gets warning over territorial violations

THE UNITED States has been warned to keep its Mediterranean fleet out of Libyan territorial waters, or face a military confrontation. On 29th September, Muammer Qadhafi, the Libyan leader, said any American naval or aerial incursion could trigger a major confrontation in the Mediterranean, and that avoiding such a confrontation was difficult.

'We have not gone to America's shores. It is the Americans who came through the Mediterranean and Europe to the edges of our territorial waters and airspace... We have avoided a confrontation many times,' Qadhafi was quoted by JANA as saying.

The Libyan leader's statement came only a few days after reports in Washington confirmed that the United States is pursuing a policy of provocation towards the Libyan Jamahiriya by sending spy-planes to at least the very edges of Libyan air space. The Washington reports that Libya may have fired on the US planes is a further example of the American press campaign to discredit the Libyan Jamahiriya in the West. Qadhafi's 29th October statement specifically makes clear that Libya has avoided such a confrontation.

Nevertheless, US military leaders appear bent on provoking such a crisis if other aspects of the Washington reports are true. In these reports the Americans admit the regular presence of their spy-planes in the vicinity of Libyan airspace. A 19th September report in the *International Herald Tribune* refers to a US Air Force C-135 electronic eavesdropping plane 'flying at the edge of Libyan airspace' on 15th September. On 27th September, the American newspaper reported a second 'confrontation in less than a week', involving a C-135 plane, escorted by one F-14 fighter

'armed with Phoenix air-to-air missiles'. When Libyan planes arrived in the vicinity to protect Libyan airspace, an additional two Navy F-14 fighters launched from the aircraft carrier John F. Kennedy came out of their hiding places to join the C-135.

In respect of the first reported incident, despite the headline 'US spy Plane said fired upon by Libyan Jets', the text of the report states, 'The American pilots saw neither the Libyan planes nor the missiles', and credits Carter administration sources as saying 'that the evidence is fragmentary'.

### Tunisian Premier to visit Libya

IN A move widely seen as a sure sign of rapprochement between Tunisia and the Libyan Jamahiriya, Tunisian Prime Minister Muhammad Mzali has been invited to pay an official visit to Tripoli. The invitation, delivered on 6th September, comes after a lengthy period of estrangement between the two countries in the wake of the Gafsa incident in January this year.

It was in fact the replacement of the government of Hedi Nouira by that of Mr Mzali in April that paved the way for the improved relations between the two north African states. Immediately on Mr Mzali's appoint-

ment the Secretary-General of the Jamahiriya's General Popular Committee, Mr Jedallah Azoursi Talhi, sent a message to the new Tunisian Premier declaring Libya's desire for a return to the normal 'brotherly relations' between the two countries. The Jamahiriya's Foreign Secretary, Dr Abdesalem Treiki, also sent a message to his new Tunisian counterpart, Mr Hassan Bal-kouja, congratulating him.

Relations between Tunisia and the Jamahiriya were soured by the uprising in the Tunisian mining town of Gafsa in January. The Tunisians blamed Libya of complicity in the affair, a charge which the Libyans consistently denied and for which no evidence has ever been produced.

### United Yemen to join the union?

ALI NASSER Muhammad, the leader of democratic Yemen, said in a statement issued in the Libyan capital on 25th September that his country and the Libyan Jamahiriya had agreed on the need for a fixed time schedule for unity between north and south Yemen, 'so that Yemen will be able to join the nucleus unitary state between Syria and Libya.'

Evidently Yemen and Libya are also at one on another major issue affecting the Arab region, for the Yemeni leader's statement went on to condemn the



fighting between Iran and Iraq. This, said Ali Nasser Muhammad, 'has no justification, is meaningless and only serves the common enemy of the Arab and Islamic nation.'

Damascus radio reported that the leader of Democratic Yemen had been received by Syrian President Assad in Damascus on 25th September on his way home to Aden. The two leaders stressed the importance of the Arab Steadfastness and Confrontation Front in promoting Arab unity against the threats posed by imperialism and Zionism. The Steadfastness Front was formed in the aftermath of Egyptian ruler Sadat's visit to occupied Jerusalem, where he capitulated to the Zionist state. The Front, comprising the Libyan Jamahiriya, Algeria, Syria, south Yemen and the Palestine Liberation Organisation, is dedicated to thwarting the Camp David accords. These provide for an alliance between the United States, Israel and the Sadat regime while at the same time denying the Palestinian people their rights to national self-determination.

## Arab People's Congress backs unity moves

THE PERMANENT Secretariat of the Arab People's Congress, meeting in emergency session in the Syrian capital Damascus from 15th-17th September, issued a strong declaration of support for the union between the Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria.

The Secretariat announced its firm adoption of the Tripoli declaration on the establishment of unity between Libya and Syria and declared their conviction that the document constituted 'the beginning of a decisive phase, which will introduce a qualitative change in the progressive national liberation struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction.'

In addition, the Permanent Secretariat adopted resolutions calling on Iraq to join the union between Libya and Syria and for solidarity between the Arab people and the Iranian Revolution. The Secretariat denounced all attempts to undermine the latter.

## British Liberal Party leader calls for talks with PLO

MR DAVID Steel, leader of the British Liberal Party, has urged the Zionist government to enter a dialogue with the Palestinian Liberation Organisation with a view to attaining a settlement of



British Liberal Party Leader David Steel, MP, holds talks with Mayor Bassam Shaka of occupied Nablus during the Liberal Party Conference in September. Later Mr Steel met with Yasser Arafat in Damascus.

the Palestine problem. 'Our anxiety is that as long as the Israelis stand back and listen to rhetoric and never actually get into dialogue, they cannot find out what the PLO's attitudes are or the prospects of reaching a settlement,' Mr Steel said in Jerusalem on 29th September.

The Liberal leader was heading a party fact-finding mission which had already met President Assad of Syria and King Hussein of Jordan and had spent two hours in discussions with the PLO leader Mr Yasser Arafat in Beirut. This was the first time that the leader of a British parliamentary party had met with the PLO Chairman. In occupied Palestine the Liberals met prominent Zionist politicians and West Bank leaders, but were spurned by the Israeli premier. It was believed that Mr Beigin's refusal to meet Mr Steel's party stemmed from his anger at the meeting between the British delegation and the Palestinian leader.

At his press conference in Jerusalem, Mr Steel said he had been impressed at the extent of the support for the PLO amongst the Palestinians of the 1967 occupied territories.

## Jamahiriya aids Islam in Korea

MORE THAN sixty Muslim leaders from around the world

gathered in the South Korean city of Pusan on 12th September for the inauguration of the country's third mosque and Islamic centre. A ground-breaking ceremony was held two days later for an Islamic university near the capital, Seoul. The mosque and Islamic centre at Pusan, the second largest city in South Korea, was financed by a grant of more than \$500,000 from the Libyan Jamahiriya.

At a dinner for the visiting dignitaries, South Korea's Acting Prime Minister, Nam Duckwo, stressed the importance of the Arab and Islamic states to his country. 'The existing economic partnership must be further consolidated and the avenue of exchanges in religion, culture and other areas should be broadened between Korea and Islamic countries,' he said. Amongst the guests at the dinner were Dr Muhammad Ahmed al Sharif, Secretary of the Tripoli-based Islamic Call Society, Ayatollah Alame Yahya Noori, of Iran's Revolutionary Council, and Sheikh al Ansari, the director of Islamic Affairs in Qatar.

The ties between Korea and the Arab states are already strong in the economic field. South Korean companies are playing a very active role in the economic development programmes of the Arab countries and about 100,000 Koreans are working in the Arab homeland. South Korea,

meanwhile, depends on the Arab states for most of its oil. Religious ties seem certain to grow increasingly close, for the number of Muslims in South Korea has already reached 26,000 only 25 years after the introduction of the religion to the country.

## Churches increase aid to African guerrillas

THE WORLD Council of Churches has announced a sharp increase in its assistance to freedom fighters in southern Africa. This year the South West Africa People's Organisation will receive \$200,000 and the African National Congress \$150,000 from the Geneva-based body.

In 1978, the last year in which the WCC gave aid to these organisations, SWAPO received \$125,000 and the ANC \$25,000. Aid to SWAPO and the ANC represents almost half of a record \$755,000 allocated by the WCC this year to combat racism. In addition, the WCC is providing \$90,000 to a variety of pro-African liberation organisations, including the Anti-Apartheid Movement in Britain.

This large outlay is in line with the WCC's long-term view that 'the situation in southern Africa is recognised as a priority due to the overt and intensive nature of white racism and the increasing awareness on the part of the oppressed in their struggle for liberation.' From 1970 to 1979 the WCC contributed \$498,000 to SWAPO and \$145,000 to ANC.

## Islamic states seek Israel's expulsion from UN

A 43-nation Islamic conference has called for Israel to be expelled from the United Nations General Assembly and for the big powers and international organisations to adopt sanctions against Israel in accordance with the UN Charter. The conference also called for a total boycott of all countries that recognised Israel's annexation of Arab Jerusalem or established diplomatic missions in the occupied city.

The final statement of the extraordinary session of the Islamic Foreign Ministers' conference, held in Fez, Morocco, from 18th-20th September, called on the UN General Assembly 'not to accept the credentials of the Israeli delegation to the United Nations as being a representative of a

government that has aggressed itself against international legitimacy and has turned Jerusalem into a capital for itself.'

The conference decided 'to ask the big powers and the international organisations to shoulder their responsibilities and to counter the Israeli challenge by the adoption of sanctions against Israel in accordance with the UN Charter.'

While applauding the action of the states that had moved their diplomatic missions out of Jerusalem at the behest of the Islamic states, the conference warned that it would 'apply an economic and political boycott against countries which recognise the Israeli decision, contribute to its implementation or establish embassies in Jerusalem.'

The conference, which was attended by a delegation from the Libyan Jamahiriya, was convened at the request of the Islamic Conference's Jerusalem Committee, which met in August in Casablanca at the request of the Palestine Liberation Organisation to consider the new Israeli law that declares occupied Jerusalem the Zionist state's 'eternal and undivided capital'.

## Arafat warns on Lebanon

PLO CHAIRMAN Yasser Arafat has warned that continued Zionist aggression against south Lebanon threatens to plunge the Middle East into another full-scale war. Zionist Premier Menachem Beigin has admitted that his forces are now on the offensive against the Palestinian resistance and their Lebanese allies, taking advantage of the fact that the American elections mean the absence of the mild rebukes which the Zionists might have to endure from the US at other times.

Beigin has said that Israel will no longer wait for resistance operations, but will strike against Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon whenever it pleases. In the latest series of raids, Zionist soldiers used equipment supplied by the Americans on the express understanding that it would be used only for the 'defence' of the areas occupied by the Zionists in 1948. It is clear that only the military strength of the Palestinian resistance has deterred Israel from repeating its March, 1978, full-scale invasion of south Lebanon.

The series of raids on Palestinian camps and positions in Lebanon, which continued throughout August and September, has been described by Zionists as 'Litani-2'. 'Litani-1' was the March 1978 invasion. But the Zionists have had to think again about the nature of the operation. In mid-August, a combined Zionist air and land



Arab scouts enjoy an international summer camp in the Libyan Jamahiriya this year.

operation to neutralise Palestinian positions, particularly those in and around the ancient Crusader-built Beaufort Castle, was defeated by Palestinian fighters after several hours of hand to hand fighting.

Thirty Zionist soldiers were killed or wounded in the attack, the PLO announced later. Having failed to achieve their objectives through their infantry assault, the Zionists reverted to their familiar tactic of aerial and artillery bombardment of Palestinian positions, in which the Zionist-armed militia of right-wing renegade former Lebanese Army major Sa'ad Haddad also participated.

At the end of August, a Syrian jet fighter was shot down after challenging Israeli jets which had intruded into Lebanese air space. At the beginning of September, Israeli jets attacked Senegalese soldiers of the United Nations peace-keeping force near Nabatiyeh; five soldiers were wounded, and a Lebanese child lost an arm in the attack. Later in September, Palestinian fighters repulsed a second Zionist raid, by sea and air, on a refugee camp near Tyre.

The PLO warned that these continuing attacks, 'blessed by the United States', were 'designed to strike at the entire Arab nation, with a view to imposing Camp David and the autonomy plot.'

## Opposition to US bases in Oman and Somalia

THE LIBYAN Jamahiriya, Algeria, Democratic Yemen and

the Palestine Liberation Organisation, all members of the Arab Steadfastness and Confrontation Front, have demanded the expulsion of Oman and Somalia from the Arab League, the Libyan news agency JANA reported on 6th September.

The Steadfastness Front, created to oppose the Camp David accords between Israel and Egypt, said the two countries had 'failed their independence and sovereignty, and endangered Arab national security' by accepting United States military bases on their territory.

The President of Democratic Yemen, meanwhile, has sent a message to Saudi Arabian leaders condemning Oman and Somalia for granting military facilities to the United States, Aden state radio reported. In a message carried to Saudi Arabia's King Khalid by a Yemen envoy, south Yemen's power in Oman and Somalia 'constitutes a danger not only to the sovereignty of the two countries but also to the security and stability of the entire area.' Muhammad pointed out that such actions by Oman and Somalia violate Arab League and Muslim Conference charters and go against the principles of the non-aligned movement.

It is not only Arab states that are concerned at the consequences of the growing network of American military bases in the Middle East region. It was reported on 1st September that Ethiopian leader Mengistu Haile Mariam had told President Carter that the US agreement to use military facilities in Somalia was a threat to stability in the Horn of Africa. The Ethiopian news agency said that Lt Col Mengistu had asked the Carter administration to 'reassess its policy and take corrective measures.'

## Omar Mukhtar's martyrdom observed

TUESDAY 16TH September was the 49th anniversary of the martyrdom of the Libyan resistance fighter Omar Mukhtar, and a huge popular rally was held at Salouk to mark the occasion. It was Omar Mukhtar, one of the greatest of Libya's national heroes, who for 25 years conducted an unremitting campaign of guerrilla warfare against the Italian invaders of Libya until his capture and subsequent execution by them at Salouk.

In a speech to the rally, Libyan revolutionary leader Muammer Qadhafi said Omar Mukhtar epitomised all the qualities of a brave soldier. He had, without reference to anyone else, taken the decision to offer his life in the service of his people. It was Omar Mukhtar's spirit, said Qadhafi, that had inspired the Free Unionist Officers' Movement to overthrow the corrupt regime of King Idris in 1969 and replace it with a political system that offered the Libyan people real freedom.

Colonel Qadhafi also drew the lessons of the struggle of Omar Mukhtar against the Italian invaders. 'The future of the Arab nation is being threatened now just as the Libyan people were then,' he declared. But such struggles as that of Omar Mukhtar demonstrated that 'There has never been a force that could impose oppression upon us forever.'

At the Solouk rally, Brother Qadhafi laid the foundation stone for a new mosque, a school for the teaching of the Quran, a library, a museum for the Libyan resistance against the Italians, and a memorial for the great patriot Sheikh Omar Mukhtar.



ONLY TEN days following the call by the Libyan Leader Muammer Qadhafi for union between the Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria, the formation of the new state was announced in a joint declaration issued by the two sides. In his speech marking the eleventh anniversary of the Al Fateh Revolution of 1969, Brother Qadhafi took observers by surprise when he declared to a mass rally in Tripoli's Green Square that he proposed that the People's Congresses should consider a unity merger between the two countries.

Brother Qadhafi had stressed, in his 1st September speech, the problems now confronting Syria in the face of persistent aggressions from the Zionists, and the burdens being carried by the Syrian people in their defence of the Arab homeland. The Libyan people, Qadhafi proposed, should declare their readiness to help bear this burden.


In advance of his speech, Brother Qadhafi had already been in telephone contact with President Hafez Assad, the Syrian leader, to discuss the current situation in the region. In addition, the Libyan leader's 1st September speech was transmitted via satellite for live broadcast on television sets throughout Syria.

The quest for Arab unity is a fundamental principle of the Libyan Revolution, and previous decisions of the basic people's congresses already commit the country to union with any other prepared to act in the cause of unity. Similarly, Syria with its Baathist commitment to Arab unity holds the same principles on this point.

The union is therefore a natural one, as Syria's President Hafez Assad stressed in his immediate response in a telegram to Muammer Qadhafi. The Syrian leader declared that Arab unity is 'the guaranteed path by which to build socialism, eliminate exploitation and defend the Arab world against all aggression.'

Unity, said President Assad was not 'a transient political issue', rather it was 'a question of principle and destiny'.

In both Libya and Syria the moves towards union are being forged at local and popular levels. In Syria the National and Regional Commands of the Ba'ath Party convened to consider the Libyan proposal, and expressed their complete support for the union. The Ba'ath Party said in a statement that unity was both an end and a means. It was, the Syrians said, an end in itself, because it meant a return to the original situation of the Arab nation; one nation must live in one state. It was a means of building strength with which to face the enemy, and a social, economic and cultural foundation for building the socialist, unified Arab community. The concept of union proposed by Qadhafi was a logical move from the unity which binds the two countries in their membership of the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front against the Camp David agreements and the policies of the Sadat regime in its alliance with the Zionists.



## Union agreed for Libya and Syria

**AS THE Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria move towards union of the two countries, vigorous efforts to provide secure foundations for the move are being taken to ensure that the scheme has the full backing and support of the citizens. This report examines the steps towards this important merger of the two Arab states.**

The Ba'ath statement stressed that the two countries, in the east and the west of the Arab homeland, represent through their merger the will of the Arab nation to reject isolation between two regions of the homeland, and the determination that the occupation of Palestine would be ended.

Meanwhile, in the Libyan Jamahiriya the Basic People's Congresses met in communities throughout the country to discuss the union proposal. Under Libya's system of popular democracy all such decisions must have the backing of the country's citizens, and the popular review process will continue at all stages to consider the details of the union. With union a fundamental principle of the Jamahiriya's Third Universal Theory and a part

of the political programme previously endorsed by the basic congresses, it was natural that Qadhafi's proposal should be backed.

Given the obvious popular support for union in both countries, President Assad and a high level Syrian delegation flew into Tripoli on 8th September for talks.

When the two leaders appeared before crowds in Tripoli, Brother Qadhafi said that vital decisions would have to be taken from the outset if unity was to succeed. It was necessary, he said, to create a polarisation between the people and those forces opposed to popular interests. He warned of the Arab right wing which was linked to Washington. It was part of a chain of world-wide exploitation. And in a firm warning to America and her allies in the Arab homeland, Qadhafi declared that the Arab people could never form an alliance with Zionist and reaction.

In a tribute to Brother Qadhafi, President Assad said, 'This call has emanated from a noble man who believes deeply in one Arab nation, and works ceaselessly for its unity.'


He continued, 'Colonialism divided our united nation. Let us work together to erase these traces of colonialism from the entire Arab nation.'

The Syrian leader stressed that Arab unity was the most basic necessary requirement for the victory of the Palestinian cause. Although Sadat and all secessionists and reactionaries were enemies of the Arab people, Assad expressed his confidence that 'our brothers in Egypt will never give in'. The Egyptian people, he predicted, 'will return to us.'

Following two days of talks, a joint decision was issued announcing the creation of the unified state, in which all authority will be vested in the hands of the people. The new union will have a single identity at the international level; the two countries' leaderships will form one revolutionary leadership. The new state will have a general national congress and one executive authority. The decision concluded by saying that the leaderships of the two countries would meet to formulate measures for the implementation of the decision within a month.

A joint declaration from the two sides was issued simultaneously, expanding on the decision. The declaration said that the new state would shoulder its responsibilities in such a way that authority would belong to the people, through democratic institutions — congresses and popular committees. The political basis would be socialist and committed to Arab revolution in order to overcome social and economic backwardness in the Arab homeland and to lead the Arab nation to victory over Zionism and imperialism.

The new state, the declaration added, would be a nucleus for complete Arab unity, and open to every Arab state willing to adhere to its political principles and join its struggle.



**IN THEIR approach to the merger of the Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria, western commentators have varied from the hostile to the sceptical. Many, of course, openly wish to see the union fail. However, there are grounds to share the optimism expressed by the Libyan and Syrian people, as Phil Kenny explains.**

## Unity: What are the prospects?

IN HIS 1st September speech in which Muammer Qadhafi called for a union between the Jamahiriya and Syria, the Libyan leader placed great emphasis on the threats to the Arab homeland and the heavy burden placed on the Syrian Arab people. To relieve this burden it was the task of all patriotic Arab nationalists to come to Syria's aid, and union into a single political entity was the most tangible expression of support and faith in the ultimate Arab victory over the threats they now face.

Those western commentators sceptical, and even hostile, to Qadhafi's vision of union have been quick to cite the previous unsuccessful attempts by both countries to unite with others. In particular they point to the United Arab Republic formed between Gamal Abdul Nasser's Egypt and Syria in 1958, and which broke up when right wing army officers forced Syrian secession in 1962.

However, from the statements of Libyans such as Muammer Qadhafi and Abdul Salam Jalloud, it is evident that this time the lessons of the past are being carefully assessed to avoid a repe-



Brother Qadhafi with Syria's President Assad in Tripoli

titution of past failures. As Brother Qadhafi has said, this is not 1958 — more than twenty years of bitter experience in dealing with the enemies of the Arab nation has taught valuable lessons.

In addition, the international situation has changed beyond all recognition in the past twenty years. Then, Egypt and Syria were just recovering from the tri-partite aggression of 1956 launched by Israel in collaboration with France and Britain. Egypt, under Nasser, was in its early days of a new era of Arab nationalist renaissance. In the African continent, there were then more colonies than independent countries. The anti-imperialist struggle which was to challenge the former European empires was in its early days, inspired by Egypt's 23rd July 1952 Revolution.

Two decades of national liberation struggle have brought most African states to nominal independence, and although neo-colonialism still holds many to the West, and the United States has emerged as the leading imperialist country, the struggle of the Arab and other Third World peoples have reduced the powers of the

imperialists and enlarged the abilities of the Third World peoples to control their political destinies.

On the Arab level, the same forces of liberation have been at work. Two wars against the Zionists have shown that they can be defeated, even with virtually limitless US backing. The re-birth of the Palestinian resistance has been central to the revival of Arab determination, and the most serious challenge to Israel's military domination of the region. Without this challenge Israel may well have succeeded in achieving further legitimacy for its occupation of Arab lands from other reactionary Arab rulers — those kings and presidents with no national honour, as Qadhafi puts it.

Instead of submission to Zionism, the Steadfast Front has emerged, strong and defiant, embracing the Libyan Jamahiriya, Syria, Algeria, Democratic Yemen and the PLO. The result has been, in part, to deter other Arab regimes from following the Sadat path to Camp David. And it is this new mood of Arab dignity and defiance which provides the most secure foundations for the new union between



**THE CALL** for union between the Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria made by Muammer Qadhafi in his 1st September speech in Tripoli, and the subsequent moves in both countries towards this end have been warmly and enthusiastically welcomed throughout the Arab homeland.

Of particular significance were the statements from leaders in the Arabian Gulf states, often considered by western commentators to be more aligned to Washington and Whitehall than Arab nationalism.

The United Arab Emirates is itself a union of seven smaller sheikdoms, and it was therefore no surprise — to the Arabs at least — that the UAE Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr Rashid Abdulla, should declare, 'The UAE welcomes the proposed unity, and gives it full support in conformity with its standing and deep belief in unity as the way to achieve the objectives of the Arab nation.' The union represented a real contribution to bolstering Arab solidarity in the face of the Arab nation's enemies, he said.

The Saudi Royal Court also expressed approval of the plan, declaring it

## Arab leaders welcome Libya's union moves

**THE CALL** for union between the Libyan Jamahiriya and Syria made by Muammer Qadhafi in his 1st September speech in Tripoli, and the subsequent moves in both countries towards this end have been warmly and enthusiastically welcomed throughout the Arab homeland.

to be 'a good start for greater unity and wider solidarity between states of the Arab community.' There were hopes from the Saudi Court that union between Libya and Syria would 'bring good to our Arab and Islamic nations, and help it to retrieve its stolen rights and usurped holy places.'

Jordan, Syria's southern neighbour, also welcomed the merger plan. Information Minister Adnan Abu Awdah expressed the belief that it would 'help to strengthen the Arab cause.' For the Palestinians, PLO Executive Chairman Yasser Arafat also welcomed the move.

In Algeria, President Benjedid Chadli, in a letter to President Assad and Colonel Qadhafi, said that Algeria wished the union well, and added that he believed it marked a significant step on the road to unity in the Arab world. Meanwhile, in Tunis on the 15th September at the Arab League meeting, the League's Secretary General Mr Chedli Klibi, paid tribute to the efforts for unity between Libya and Syria. And in Aden the President of Democratic Yemen, a partner of Syria and Libya in the Steadfastness Front, pledged his country's support for the union.

Further support for the union came from the Secretary General of the Egyptian Patriotic Movement, Lt Col Saadeddin Shazli, and the Commander of the Lebanese Arab Army, Ahmed Khatib.

Libya and Syria, and the prospects for its success.

Additionally, of course, both Libyans and Syrians are determined that this union should be forged not simply out of idealism, a sense of destiny, or their common heritage. Both are conscious that each step and every development towards union must be assessed against the experiences of past failures. This point is stressed time and time again by political commentators in Tripoli.

Certainly one failure of the past is being studiously avoided. The union twenty years ago between Syria and Egypt, like others that were attempted in later years, was planned and executed at leadership level. None was a union of the people of the countries involved, and as a consequence all were frail and fragile, all too easy to abandon or subvert by another clique.

It is for this reason that, in Syria and Libya alike, the fullest discussions have been activated at the popular levels to ensure that the moves towards union are based on the widest possible constituency of grass roots support.

And there are other factors which should act to cement the union. Firstly there are the contemporary political characteristics of the two countries with their similar Arab nationalist, socialist principles, their common concern regarding the Palestine question, and their political systems which although different are both popular and democratic.

Apart from the ideal of union which both peoples share, the scheme is seen as offering very tangible benefits for both

countries, and although the union was not proposed for material gain, this is a factor which should be taken into account. Were the balance of benefits by one community over another not reasonably equal this could be exploited by regionalist forces, as those opposed to Arab unity are termed.

On the economic level, the union makes sense. Libya, as an oil exporter, has large revenues which it cannot spend on development in the main because of its shortage of personnel. Syria, with its far larger population, has many qualified people such as engineers, doctors, and administrators, who would be of great assistance in Libyan development projects. Also the manufacturing capacities of the two countries are complementary, while the union will provide a wider 'home' market for both Syrian and Libyan consumer products. Not only could Libya use Syrian personnel in development, but Syria could absorb Libyan funds to develop both industry and agriculture. Syria has a highly developed agricultural sector, and the basic foods — some of which the Jamahiriya still needs to import — can be produced in Syria more cheaply than in Libya where costs of turning desert into agricultural land are high.

However, the practical impact of the union in the first instance will be military. Libya's weapons and trained personnel will be at the disposal of the new state's combined armed forces. Thus military strength will be brought to bear in areas where it is vitally needed. Syria faces the Zionist enemy on her own territory, the Golan, and the country is also in danger from the repeated Israeli attacks on south

Lebanon, which threaten at any time to involve Syrian peace-keeping forces in that country.

Already it is reported that Libya has paid the equivalent of \$600 million towards Syria's international debts, mainly for defence equipment. As a confrontation state, Syria has received costs of defending herself against Israeli aggressions from its fellow Arab states. At present it is believed to be about \$1,500 million annually. Syria has said that this needs to be boosted to \$5,000 million, to match the amount spent by Israel and donated by the United States for Israeli military equipment. The union thus provides an immediate, highly practical, form of assistance.

In the long term, the strengthening of the Syrian-Lebanese front against Israeli aggression will alter the political situation in the region. The logic of the Zionists in concluding a separate peace agreement with the Sadat regime was that it would then be possible for them to defeat Syria militarily if she fought alone. Politically, Syria could then be discounted. But the increased military capacity of the new unified state will bring its political consequences. The prospects for the Palestinian resistance are considerably improved.

So, for historical, political, military and economic reasons, the prospects for the new union are bright. The details will be hammered out, but contrary to the jibes of Sadat and his echoes in the western media, the union is more soundly based in mutual interest and respect than any previous attempt at Arab unity.



American arms build-up in the Middle East

## We will fight the United States but not the Arabs

**A WARNING** of the increasing American pressure in the Arab homeland, coupled with a plea that Arab should not fight Arab came from Libya's revolutionary leader Muammer Qadhafi during September. Libya, he said, would not fight Egypt. Instead tanks should be abandoned for tractors to turn minefields into farm fields, and trenches into water channels.

LIBYAN REVOLUTIONARY leader Muammer Qadhafi has called for the Arab nation to expel the military bases being implanted by the United States in the Arab homeland. He has also called for the Arabs to avoid internecine squabbles that only serve to weaken their strength and enhance that of Israel and America. He urged the people's congresses in the Libyan Jamahiriya to 'approve a strategic policy that excludes confrontation between the Libyan armed forces and those of Egypt, or between the Libyan people and the Egyptian people.'

Speaking in early September at the passing-out ceremony of the Tajurah Air Force college, the Libyan leader reviewed the steady progress that has been made by the United States in its programme of acquiring military bases in the Arab homeland. 'American forces have started to penetrate the Arab homeland, and have occupied bases in Egypt, Somalia and Oman,' he said. 'The Arab nation is, once again,

about to lose its independence; in fact there are three regions which have already lost their independence and they are Egypt, Oman and Somalia.'

Colonel Qadhafi emphasised that the Arab posture vis-à-vis the American bases was essentially defensive. 'We have not decided to invade American land. America is the one that decided to cross the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Arabian Sea and to invade Arab shores and establish on them bases at Marsa Matruh on the Mediterranean, at Ghardaqah on the Red Sea, on the Oman coast, and at Berbera in Somalia. America is the one that decided to invade Arab soil. It is the one that has violated the sanctity of Arab airspace, water and territory,' he declared.

Colonel Qadhafi stressed that the fact that the American forces had been invited to establish bases in the Arab homeland by certain Arab governments was irrelevant. For 'The Arab homeland is the home of all Arabs, and if the independence of any part of the Arab homeland is violated, the independence of the whole Arab homeland is violated. The occupation of any part of the Arab homeland constitutes a colonisation of the whole Arab world.'

By opposing this colonisation, argued the Libyan leader, the Arabs were merely exercising their legitimate right to defend themselves against an aggressor. Unless the Americans were resisted, he warned, they would continue their advance into Arab territory, 'and consequently the Arab nation will lose its independence and become an American-Israeli colony.'

The Libyan leader launched an impassioned appeal for the Arab states to avoid exhausting their strength in fratricidal conflicts. Such conflicts were in the interests of the Arabs' enemies, who were

constantly engaged in fomenting them. 'America and the Israelis want a confrontation between the Libyan armed forces and the Egyptian armed forces, between the Syrian army and the Lebanese army, between the armies of North and South Yemen,' declared the Libyan leader. 'Our decision,' he went on, 'should be to abolish for ever the confrontation that colonialism wants between the Arab armies, and transform this confrontation into one between the Arab armies and those of America and the Israelis.'


As a practical step to minimise the danger of inter-Arab disputes, Colonel Qadhafi announced that he was suggesting to the people's congresses in the Libyan Jamahiriya that they should 'approve a strategic policy that excludes confrontation between the Libyan armed forces and those of Egypt, or between the Libyan people and the Egyptian people for ever.' He continued: 'I have suggested to the people's congresses that tractors, instead of tanks, should move to Tobruk and Jaghboub, and transform minefields into farm fields and trenches into water channels.'

Colonel Qadhafi stressed that the United States was not an invincible power, pointing to the American defeat in Vietnam as proof. 'America used all its might to defeat the people of Vietnam, but in the end it was defeated by the Vietnamese people.' The defeat, argued the Libyan leader, constituted 'proof that America is a paper tiger.'

Colonel Qadhafi concluded his speech to the Air Force graduates by emphasising that the time had come to check the advance of the US forces in the Arab homeland. 'It should be clear,' he said, 'that we are preparing for a comprehensive, strategic, wide-scale confrontation of the American forces that have started to advance on Arab soil and of the Zionist camp in Palestine.' He declared, 'We should be determined to achieve final victory over our enemies, and I say to you in conclusion that it is not impossible to defeat America and the Israelis.'

The Libyan Jamahiriya's determined opposition to the establishment of foreign military bases in the Arab homeland is both long standing and well-known. It is encouraging that other, traditionally western orientated, Arab states now seem to be growing increasingly aware of the dangers posed by such bases. A few days after the Libyan leader's speech at Tajurah, he was handed a message from Sheikh Zayed, the President of the United Arab Emirates, in which the Gulf leader praised the stand taken by the Jamahiriya on the question of foreign bases. The Libyan news agency JANA quoted Sheikh Zayed as saying: 'We fully agree with brother Colonel Muammer Qadhafi on the necessity to adopt quick, decisive and effective measures as well as a united Arab stand to confront dangers threatening the Arab nation as a result of the establishment of foreign bases in some Arab states.'






Egypt's Dr Ahmed Abdelal



International Solidarity



Omar al Hamdi

## American intrigues in Middle East a threat to Arab rights

THE SIGNING of the Camp David accords between Israel, Egypt and the United States was to herald the start of a new era in American foreign policy. Although since the end of World War II Washington had played a key role in the Arab homeland, securing economic strength at home through the exploitation of Arab oil resources, and protecting the Zionist settler state in Palestine through subversion against progressive forces in the Arab homeland, American defeats in South-East Asia led to a period, albeit brief, of retrenchment from active interference in the affairs of foreign nations. Camp David was to signal an end to this retrenchment, and the launch of a new and vigorous campaign against Arab nationalist forces committed to the Arab people's rights to the political, economic and social development of their homeland free from foreign interference.

As a consequence of the new American doctrine, those Arab peoples and regimes opposed to the Washington plans for the Middle East have come under sustained assault. Through a campaign of psychological, economic and political warfare, the United States has displayed its determination to destabilise those forces opposed to the imposition of American influence in the region.

In every respect of progress within the Arab homeland and the Arab efforts to re-assert control over their own affairs, the Libyan Jamahiriya since the 1st September Revolution of 1969 has been a focal force. On the military level, the Libyan revolutionary forces made the expulsion

**WITH THE United States playing an increasingly assertive foreign policy role in the Middle East and surrounding areas, more than 156 organisations assembled in Tripoli during late August for an international conference to examine recent trends in American and Arab politics, and to express support for the Libyan Arab people now under increasing threats from the US and her client regimes in the region. Louis Eaks examines the background to this important conference and the political resolutions adopted in Tripoli.**

of foreign military bases from Libyan territory an early priority. As a consequence Britain and the United States were forced to evacuate their bases from a strategic territory in North Africa. On the economic level, the Libyan revolution provided the determination within OPEC for the oil producing nations to confront the multi-nationals and the consumer nations, bringing to a successful conclusion the producers' just demands that they

receive a fair and equitable price for their national resources. Needless to say, this legal assertion of their rights by Libya and the other oil producing nations was translated into an act of aggression against the consumer nations by the western media and political leaders. Finally, on the political level, the Al Fateh Revolution in Libya acted to reinforce and mobilise Arab progressive forces committed to asserting Arab national rights in Palestine, and the right of the Arab people to freely determine their social, political and economic future without foreign and imperialist interference. On each of these levels, the Libyan people have provided a motivating and progressive influence within the Arab world, thereby frustrating American as well as other imperialist schemes.

The result of the Jamahiriya's bold and determined efforts to re-assert Arab dignity has been a concerted campaign by the United States and her regional allies to destabilise the Libyan Revolution. To the east, the Libyan people now face military threats from the Sadat regime, acting as proxy for the Americans in a re-enactment of the Vietnamisation process operated by the US in South-East Asia. Libya, along with the Arab progressive movement, also faces direct military intervention by the United States from new military bases now being established in Somalia, Kenya, Oman, and fleets in the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean. Similarly in Syria, American and Zionist intentions are manifested in the resurgence of a well-funded Muslim Brother-


hood organisation, while in Algeria regionalist schemes centre on fostering the so-called Berber nationalism. The Gafsa incident which deeply soured relations between Libya and Tunisia may well also have been US inspired, despite the efforts by the American and French news agencies to implicate Libya.

That the United States has a second scheme for the direct military occupation of the Libyan Jamahiriya should Sadat fail in his mission is no secret. Less appreciated by progressive forces in the West is the constant and systematic propaganda campaign being waged against the Al Fateh revolution in a classic destabilisation campaign similar to that which the Americans used so successfully in Chile.

It was against this background of serious and sustained efforts by the Americans to undermine the progressive forces in the Arab homeland and their resistance to Washington's schemes to control the region that some 156 delegations from around the world arrived in the Libyan Jamahiriya to express support for and solidarity with the Libyan Arab people. Their presence in Tripoli provided the opportunity to observe and understand the achievements of the Al Fateh Revolution in the eleven years since 1969. These are evident enough in Tripoli: a prosperous country with her well clothed and fed people, the massive new housing development schemes, clinics, hospitals and schools, the newly established system of democracy and people's authority.

And during the three-day international conference, participants were able to hear from the Libyan people themselves of the crisis now facing the Arab nation. Muammer Qadhafi summarised the world crisis when he referred to the efforts of the imperialist countries to subject the peoples of the developing world to permanent backwardness (see inset for report on Qadhafi's speech). Ahmed Shahati, Secretary General of the Foreign Liaison Bureau of the Jamahiriya considered the crisis to be between imperialism on the one hand and those joined 'in a revolution for freedom'. He stressed the Revolution's commitment to 'freedom and liberty for all peoples irrespective of their nationality'. Omar al Hamdi, the Secretary General of the Arab People's Congress, and himself a Libyan Arab, stressed that the Arab people 'are seeking justice and peace' and contrasted this to the Zionist aggressions against the Arab people, and the military threats posed against the Libyan people by the Sadat regime in Egypt.

The presence of members of the Egyptian National Movement underlined the fact that Sadat does not enjoy the backing of the majority of the Egyptian people. Adeb Dimitri said his organisation felt 'it has a growing responsibility in supporting the people of the Jamahiriya because of the direct imperialist threat designed to destroy the Steadfastness Front and Arab resistance, and to strengthen Sadat's regime.'



Muammer Qadhafi calls for 'positive neutralism'

## Qadhafi warns of threat to 'Peace, progress and liberty'

THE EFFORTS and the achievements of the Libyan Jamahiriya to rid its territory, and the Arab region as a whole, of foreign influences, and the quest of the Al Fateh Revolution to stand by those oppressed peoples struggling to achieve dignity and liberty are the reasons behind the current American inspired intrigues and threats towards Libya. This was the message of Muammer Qadhafi when he addressed the World Conference in Solidarity with the People of the Jamahiriya, in Tripoli on 30th September.

The leader of the Al Fateh Revolution called on progressive and democratic forces in the world to confront what he described as 'economic and military threats which are always at hand ready to attack every initiative towards emancipation.' The Libyan people, along with the oppressed peoples of the Arab and Third Worlds were, he added, 'the targets of terrorist military moves in particular, and of economic blackmail and enforced social backwardness in general.'

The imperialist schemes directed at the Libyan people were the direct result of their 'key role in safeguarding world peace, security and well-being, and in seeking a just distribution of economic resources in an attempt to abolish poverty and exploitation.'

Brother Qadhafi pointed out that Libya's 1st September Revolution had 'established direct popular democracy through the abolition of government and the establishment of People's Congresses, People's Committees and Revolutionary Committees.' These, he continued, 'constituted a living example of how mankind could attain freedom from oppression and exploitation by following the dicta of The Green Book.'

On the military level, the Libyan

people had 'put an end to at least five US military bases and two British naval and air bases, which literally occupied Libya.' Qadhafi continued, 'The expulsion of these bases, which were aimed directly at the people of the Middle East, Africa, and the Soviet Union, liberated 2,000 kilometres of Mediterranean coastline from colonialist bases. This brought the day very near when the Mediterranean will become a region of peace, devoid of foreign military bases.'

The Libyan leader spoke of the efforts of American imperialism and its allies in the region to surround the Libyan Jamahiriya. Referring to 'this ugly tripartite alliance' of the United States, the Zionists and the Sadat regime, Brother Qadhafi warned that all democratic forces in the Arab homeland were under threat and not merely the Libyan peoples. Nevertheless, because of the Libyan Revolution's achievements in confronting foreign influences in the region, and its determination to do so in the future, the Jamahiriya faced what he described as 'the face of flagrant military challenges along its borders and in its territorial waters.'

Qadhafi saw the issue of solidarity with the Libyan Jamahiriya in its wider international context. Support for the Jamahiriya would, he said, 'give heart to Palestinian resistance, to the Syrian people locked in battle with Zionism, to the oppressed Egyptian masses, and to those of Africa and Latin America. These were the forces of 'positive neutralism' confronting American influences.'

The Libyan people, Qadhafi, pledged, would remain in the vanguard of the international movement striving for 'victory over oppression, exploitation, imperialism and racism.'



# The Tripoli Declaration: A Charter for Peace and Justice

AT THE close of the World Conference in Solidarity with the People of the Jamahiriya, delegates approved without dissent a resolution entitled *The Tripoli Declaration embracing nineteen 'fundamental principles for the reinforcement of national independence and social progress' which provide an international charter for peace and justice.*

*The Declaration is concerned with the freedom of mankind 'from all elements of suppression and exploitation', and expresses firm and resolute opposition to forces opposed to this ideal. It stresses that the efforts for liberation and justice are 'an international responsibility', and defines 'national rights and independence' in political, economic and cultural dimensions.*

*The division of national territories into mini-states in the service of world imperialism is condemned, along with the occupation of the land of others by force.*

*On the issue of exploitation, the Declaration deals not only with the economic exploitation of people in their homelands by foreign entities, but also expresses concern at the exploitation of coloured minorities and immigrant workers and the racial discrimination to which they are subjected in the host countries.*

*The developing nations, says the Declaration, must be supported in their efforts to free themselves from what it describes as 'economic annexation' so that they can 'dominate their wealth and adopt an economic,*

*social and cultural development strategy that serves their interests'. The Declaration firmly rejects 'annexation and domination by the multi-national companies', and pledges support 'for the establishment of a new international economic order for the protection of independence and national will.'*

*The Declaration also expresses concern at the domination of the international media by the developed nations, principally Britain, France and the USA. It declares support 'to strengthen and develop the information capabilities of the developing countries.'*

*On the military level, the Declaration is forthright in condemning 'the projects, pacts and military bases established by US imperialism in various parts of the world.' It specifically cites the Camp David accords, and Washington's recent military agreements with Oman and Somalia. Similarly, the conference Declaration is critical of American naval manoeuvres, which it considers a form of intimidation aimed at progressive forces in the Third World. Likewise, the Declaration criticises imperialist attacks against nationalist and progressive forces conducted by proxy by client regimes subservient to the imperialist powers.*

*Disarmament and neutrality are central themes in the sections dealing with military issues. The Declaration expresses support for 'democratic forces in Europe which aim to reduce the military presence in the conti-*

*nent and to carry out the Helsinki Agreement.' It looks forward to the 'liquidation of military blocks' and calls for 'efforts to make the Mediterranean Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Arab Sea areas of peace free from nuclear weapons and foreign military bases and navies.' The Declaration voices concern at the nuclear threats now posed by Israel and South Africa, and calls for an end to technological assistance given to the racist regimes that allows them to develop nuclear weapons of destruction.*

*The Declaration also expresses support for disarmament, efforts 'to stop the arms race and to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons and weapons of total destruction' and demands that all governments 'honour their obligations under the International Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Agreement.'*

*Five points of action are incorporated into the Declaration to secure and protect the principles outlined. These refer to the struggle for democratic freedom, independent political and labour organisations, and the right of the people to participate in the decision-making process. It also calls for unity between progressive forces, and continuous struggle against anti-democratic regimes. It asserts the need for unity within the non-aligned movement countries to be reinforced, and looks to co-operation between the peoples of the developed and the developing nations of the world in the common international struggle for justice and freedom.*

Dimitri pointed out that the Egyptian people are suffering from the collapse of the Egyptian economy as a result of the policies being pursued by the Sadat regime.

In the Final Communiqué adopted by the conference, it was stressed that the current offensive being staged by American imperialism was the response to the advances being made by national liberation movements to assert their political, social and economic independence. Imperialism was accused of activating 'plans for political, economic and military domination, with the aim of bringing the world back to its grips.' The delegates declared their support for 'the effective, civic role the great Al Fateh Revolution is taking up in fortifying the real values of freedom and liberation.' The theories and ideology of the

Libyan Revolution, the conference agreed, offer 'a better future for man, uphold his humanity, and liberate him from all forms of exploitation and physical and moral subjugation.'

With regard to the military threats confronting the Libyan Jamahiriya, the conference communiqué stated: 'The conference condemns Sadat's military concentrations along the eastern borders of the Jamahiriya, and denounces Sadat's military and informational provocations and encroachments in the implementation of the Camp David conspiracy which constitutes actual aggression against the great Al Fateh Revolution.'

The conference also supported the struggle against 'the American military bases in Egypt, Somalia, Oman and the Mediterranean, as well as other naval and air facilities that enable America to

put into action its aggressive designs.'

Another conference document declared 'absolute support for the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people and their revolution under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organisation' and the Palestinians' right 'to return to their homeland, self-determination, and the establishment of their own independent state on their soil, Palestine.' In addition support was expressed for the joint struggle of the Palestinian revolution and the Lebanese National Progressive Movement, against the attempts to partition Lebanon and destroy its Arab character. Likewise, support was given to the Palestinian people living under Zionist military occupation, and to the Syrian people confronted by 'subversive plots' to destabilise the government, and to undermine its rejection of the Camp David process.

IT IS no coincidence that the Zionist state of Israel has stepped up its assaults on southern Lebanon in recent weeks, given a new impetus to its programme of colonisation of the Arab lands seized in 1967 and put in a new request for aid from its major sponsor, the United States. Israel's leaders know that in any period leading up to US presidential elections, no incumbent US president seeking re-election dares to criticise openly the Zionist state, let alone apply real pressure on it to refrain from actions which, if committed by any other state, would at least bring forth token condemnation from Washington. The reason why Israel can — literally — get away with murder in the run-up to a US presidential election is that Zionist voters in America hold the key to the White House.

All three current contenders for the presidency are clearly fearful of the strength of the Zionist voters in America. Each has been engaged in a contest wherein he has been seeking to outbid the others in expressions of support for Israel. An intrinsic part of this campaign to win Zionist votes has been the dismissal of the national and human rights of the Palestinian people and the denigration of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, almost universally recognised as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians.

Of the three presidential hopefuls, none has gone further to seduce the Zionist voters than the self-styled Liberal John Anderson. Only he has actually visited occupied Palestine to swear his allegiance to the Beigin regime and to the precepts of Zionism. During his July visit, he put himself on record as supporting the Zionist annexation of East Jerusalem, opposing the creation of a Palestinian state and rejecting a possible role for the PLO in future negotiations over the Palestine question.

Ronald Reagan has gone almost as far. He openly acknowledges Israel's value to the United States in the latter's imperialist designs in the Arab region. He too rejects a Palestinian state and has come out in open support of the Zionist colon-

## Presidential candidates put Zionist interests first

**IN THE race to the White House, each of the contenders in the 4th November Presidential election has put strong emphasis on his commitment to the Zionists. Meanwhile, as this report shows, Israel is busy taking advantage of America's election season.**

isation of the territories seized in 1967. Like Carter, Reagan has shown no sign of concern for the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. He seems to have adopted the familiar line of Zionist propaganda which asserts that because Palestine for a few months after the First World War included the territory of what is now Jordan, then the Palestinians should, for reasons best known to Reagan, be happy to adopt Jordan as 'their' state, regardless of the fact that the territory of Jordan is not perceived by the Palestinians themselves as constituting Palestine.


President Carter, meanwhile, remains committed to the Camp David 'peace' process, which denies the Palestinians any possibility of attaining their national rights. Expressions of token support for Palestinian rights have become noticeably

less frequent from the President in recent months and have now dried up altogether. Instead, Carter is emphasising his undying commitment to the Zionist state. In his State of the Union speech, for example, he declared, 'Let no one doubt our commitment to the security of Israel.'

Why is it that the 5.7 million Jews, who account for only 2.7 per cent of the population and 4 per cent of the voters, exert such a disproportionate influence over the course of the elections? The answer lies in the structure of the American voting system. Americans do not vote directly for their President, but for members of an electoral college who choose the President. Each state has the same number of members in this college as it has Congressmen and Senators; that is, each state's electoral college strength corresponds roughly to its population. Over three-quarters of America's Jews live in the six largest states — New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio and Massachusetts — which together have 178 electoral college votes. For victory, a candidate needs 268 votes.

The Zionists have the Jewish vote well organised; in New York, about one quarter of those who bother to vote will be Jews, though they form considerably less than that proportion of the population. But to win the election, a candidate must win New York and the other large states; and to do that, he must win each state's Jewish vote. Against the Zionist lobby, the American Arab lobby is far smaller, much newer and less experienced, and must contend with an electorate so disenchanted with the 'democratic' system that most Americans — about 60 per cent — will not bother to vote for anyone at all.

A PLO statement paid tribute to the US people's role in ending the US war in Vietnam, and warned that the ruling establishment was leading them over a precipice by its continued support for Zionism. It asked Americans to remember the legitimate aspirations of people struggling for liberation, and not to tolerate the debasement of their values by candidates who the PLO described as 'small-time crooks jostling for leadership'.





## Oil Production the key to pricing

CENTRAL TO the debate at the Vienna meeting, known as the 'tri-ministerial' meeting, was the issue of prices and production levels. A ten per cent cut in oil production was informally agreed at the conference. The irony is that control of production levels has been the key to OPEC success in the past decade; but production is not officially discussed at OPEC meetings. Instead it is treated as a matter for individual producers. Yet today, as in the past, much depends on the amount of oil produced.

Libyan Foreign Secretary Dr Ali Abdusalam Treiki pointed out in Vienna: 'There is an urgent problem threatening OPEC — namely the current production surplus, which is leading to a deterioration in prices. We call for a total linkage between production and prices, and for the laying down of a production programme that takes into account primarily the interests of the developing countries.'

Dr Treiki felt that a 'long-term strategy' for OPEC, debated in Vienna, should also take security matters into consideration. 'Decisive measures must be adopted by OPEC as an organisation if there is Israeli aggression against Arab countries,' he said. Under such circumstances, Libya would stop pumping oil, the Libyan Secretary announced.

At the meeting, Saudi Arabia, represented by Oil Minister Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, resisted further cuts in production of Arab oil designed to force consumer countries to pay prices which keep pace with inflation. Saudi Arabia proposed a strategy which would automatically increase prices of OPEC oil in line with the inflation in the prices of manufactured goods from the west supplied to OPEC countries. In an attempt to pressure other OPEC members, as the meeting opened Sheikh Yamani said that Saudi Arabia, which alone accounts for over a third of OPEC's production — 9.5 million barrels a day — would neither raise its prices, nor cut its production, until other member states accepted its proposals.

Libya, Iran and Algeria opposed the formula which linked oil prices to those of western manufactured goods. They suggested instead that oil prices should be linked to the level of inflation obtaining generally in the oil producing countries.

The need for OPEC to agree a pricing policy is urgent. While some nations, such as Saudi Arabia, were charging only \$28 a barrel for crude oil, Iran, for example, was charging \$35 a barrel. Because of the higher quality of Libyan and Algerian crude, it has sold recently for up to \$37 a barrel. Prices have declined from the levels of two years ago, because the recession in the capitalist countries has reduced the demand for oil. There is now effectively a glut of oil on world markets estimated by many experts to be as much

**THE MEETING of Foreign, Finance and Oil Ministers of the thirteen member states of OPEC, the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries, took place in Vienna in September. Phil Kelly reviews the significance of the latest decisions in the light of OPEC's past, and the role which the Libyan Jamahiriya has played in transforming OPEC.**

as 2.5 or 3 million barrels of oil a day. This serves to depress prices, as it is under the control of the oil multinationals, rather than the producer countries. Thus it could be used as a weapon against the producers should they decide on a price increase. The total world stockpile of oil is believed to be some 6,700 million barrels — higher than ever in the world's history.

The importance of production levels for prices was underlined by Peter Rodgers, Energy Consultant of the London *Sunday Times* on 14th September this year. Rodgers wrote of the vital role which Libya played in gaining for the oil producers the power which they now have, by the use of production controls.

In 1968, OPEC adopted a document, 'A Declaratory Statement of Petroleum Policy', which said that henceforth, OPEC member governments would determine pricing policy; that OPEC states would strive for the greatest possible control over and shareholding in, all aspects of oil operations within their borders, and that if oil companies made excessive profits, their contracts would be renegotiated to claim it back.



Even some OPEC officials thought that this was too ambitious. The idea of national control of oil resources, now so widely accepted, seemed heresy at the time. Indeed, though Rodgers does not say this, it is highly possible that some OPEC governments agreed to the 1968 Statement precisely because they thought that its contents could never be realised. They sought no confrontation with the oil companies, or their protectors, the US and British governments.

Rodgers set out the key role which Libya played in changing these fine words into reality, to the horror of the west and the surprise even of other OPEC members: 'Late in 1969, the corrupt regime of King Idris was overthrown by Colonel Qadhafi. The Libyans had already allowed in some of the independent oil companies, which had been nipping at the heels of the giants. Qadhafi picked off the oil companies one by one. He said, in a thinly veiled threat: "The Libyan people who have lived for 5,000 years without petroleum are able to live again without".'

Leaving aside the common journalistic error of ascribing all that happens in Libya to Muammer Qadhafi, such an understanding of the significance for OPEC of the 1st September Al Fateh Revolution in Libya is rare among western journalists. But western oil companies and governments are well aware of what Libya did in 1970. It lies at the heart of the deep hatred in which they hold the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and its Revolution. Real blows were dealt to western exploitation of this precious raw material.

Rodgers went on with the story of how Libya gained control of its own oil, and so aided others to do likewise: 'The first target was the wheeler-dealing Armand Hammer, owner of Occidental Oil, a man who had made the first of his series of fortunes by trading grain with Lenin's Russia and taking paintings and treasures in payment. Pay up, or have your production cut, he was told.'

'Hammer told Esso in 1970 that he could resist if the big Sister would back him up with replacement supplies. But Esso asked such a high price that Hammer turned it down, and caved in to Libyan demands for an extra 30 cents a barrel. The front was broken and other companies followed. The Gulf Oil states demanded similar terms, and leap-frogging had started in earnest.'

'Dr Fadhil Al-Chalabi, an Iraqi who is now OPEC's deputy secretary general and was at the centre of the pricing storm during the early Seventies, says: "After five or six years' protracted negotiations the Libyans had achieved nothing — until they cut production. When we went to the next meeting, in Caracas in December 1970, everybody was conscious that unless OPEC itself did something, nothing would

change. I had strong feelings even before Caracas that the tide had turned.'

'The companies assembled in Tehran in early 1971, led by George Piercy, of Exxon, and the personable and friendly Lord Strathalmond, of BP. Talks rapidly foundered because the companies, faced with a 35 cents a barrel demand, could not get a cast iron agreement against leap-frogging,' Rodgers recounted.

At their meeting in February 1971, OPEC Ministers unanimously announced that if the increase was not agreed, it would be imposed on the companies under penalty of an oil embargo. They agreed; the settlement brought OPEC over one billion dollars a year.


Rodgers continued: 'The Tehran agreement was to last five years, but Libya leapfrogged. The dollar began to fall and there were a series of new talks over adjustments. By summer 1973, oil demand had soared again, principally because profligate American consumers began to suck in imports in vast quantities. Oil prices were soaring, but OPEC's revenue wasn't, and the organisation, now swollen to 11 members with the advent of Nigeria, asked for a fundamental renegotiation.'

'A more subtle force had been at work since the late 1960's. Producing countries had been demanding larger shareholdings in their oil industries and more say in running them. Saudi Arabia first proposed the idea of "participation", or joint shareholdings, with the oil companies, to defuse dangerous radical ideas such as nationalisation (which some OPEC members will tell you they learnt from Britain's post-war Labour government).

'But in December 1971, in a move which shook the Stock Exchange, Libya nationalised BP's share of a joint venture with Nelson Bunker Hunt and the ball began to roll. The Iraq Petroleum Company was nationalised in 1972. Saudi Arabia took a 25 per cent shareholding in the Aramco consortium of American companies, to rise eventually to 51 per cent. Kuwait upstaged them by getting 60 per cent of its own industry. The cards were being stacked against the companies,' Rodgers concluded.

The link between production and prices is dramatically demonstrated by Peter Rodgers' exposition of the Libyan experience.

Every first year economics student learns that prices are set by the interaction of supply and demand. This may be an over-simplification, but it is certainly true that market forces have a great deal more influence in determining prices than mere announcements by governments, or even inter-governmental agreements. In the present situation, where the world surplus of oil is about ten per cent of OPEC's total production of about 27 million barrels a day, those countries which are pursuing a policy of realistic prices can be systematically undercut by countries which sell their oil at lower prices.



Libyan Foreign Secretary Dr Ali Treiki calls for long-term strategy

The Islamic Republic of Iran has also been pressing for a production cut and a price increase. Iranian oil minister Ali Akhbar Moinfar said in Vienna that his country was losing up to \$4 dollars a barrel because it was being undercut on its posted prices by that amount.

Despite the traditional designation of prices as 'a matter for the individual producing countries', a great deal of informal negotiation about production level went on at Vienna.

The disagreements were not fully resolved. But reliable sources indicated that as a concession to other OPEC members, Saudi Arabia agreed to a price rise of \$2 to \$30 a barrel, without insisting — as Sheikh Yamani had done at first — that those countries with higher prices for basic crude should reduce theirs. Importantly, other sources indicated that at a final closed session, a ten per cent cut in production was agreed — though it was made clear that this could not be promulgated as an official OPEC decision. It was expected that this would allow the market to reduce the price differentials between the higher and lower levels, with the adjustment being mainly upward, towards the levels charged by Libya, Iran and Algeria.

A further triministerial meeting will take place in Europe, probably in London, on 14th October. This meeting officially, will draw up an agenda for the meeting of OPEC heads of government in Baghdad on 2nd November; but it will also give the OPEC ministers a chance to review how the interim price and production measures, and the current steadily-declining level of world economic activity, have affected oil prices.

On the issue of aid for the other nations of the Third World, the ministers made

rather more progress. They decided to press for a new dialogue within the framework of 'North-South' talks planned for next year under the auspices of the United Nations. OPEC Finance Ministers will meet on 6th October in Quito, Ecuador, to finalise details of this for presentation to their heads of government in November. Ministers in Vienna agreed that they would take part in the North-South dialogue alongside other Third World countries, and were not particularly interested in direct negotiations with the developed oil consuming countries.

Two proposals have been made for increasing the amount of aid which OPEC itself gives to other Third World countries. There is general agreement that the OPEC aid fund should be increased; there is even a proposal that it should become a full bank in its own right, though this idea does not have complete support. An alternative suggestion, that OPEC should link its aid directly to the level of oil price increases, and should invite the West to contribute sums which would be linked to the level of price inflation of western-produced manufactured goods, is now seen as a complementary, rather than a rival, scheme. Details of both are expected in November.

Despite the predictions of critics that this meeting of OPEC would be the most conflict-ridden in OPEC's 20-year history, and despite the fact that details of some of the decisions will not be finalised until the heads of government meet in November, OPEC has once again confounded the wishful thinking of western media pundits, and refused to fall apart. At least one group of Third World countries, and through them the Third World in general, will continue to have the income necessary for development.



## Arab oil revenues up, but value eroded

THE OIL revenues of the ten members of the Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries rose 56 per cent last year but world inflation and currency fluctuations eroded the increase to the 1974 value, according to the organisation's annual report. The states' revenue from oil totalled \$125,500 million (about £53,000 million) against \$80,500 million in 1978.

The group's daily output was increased to an average of 21.9 million barrels per day, 14.1 per cent more than in the previous year. The increased production was mainly to offset the loss of Iranian crude in the wake of the Revolution there. The increase came from higher production by all members except the United Arab Emirates, Syria and Bahrain, whose output dropped.

The organisation's oil output last year accounted for 34 per cent of the world total compared with 30.9 per cent in the previous year. But oil reserves, 52.4 per cent of the world total, were down by 5,500 million barrels to 336,500 million compared with 1978 estimates, because of variations in calculations.


The Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries comprises the Libyan Jamahiriya, Algeria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Syria and Egypt. Egypt's membership was suspended in April last year because of Sadat's peace treaty with the Zionist state.

## Pan Arab economic charter adopted

THE ARAB Economic and Social Council ended its 29th ordinary session on 10th September after having adopted a Pan Arab Economic Charter and a unified pan Arab Investment Convention.

The meeting considered the possibility of increasing the capital of the Arab Fund for Social and Economic Development and that of the Arab Monetary Fund. It also approved the idea of opening special accounts within these two institutions in order to help the poorer Arab states.

The Council decided to adopt a common stand vis-à-vis items on the agenda of the coming joint annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, in particular on the question of the PLO being



Libyan aid for African refugees — See Arab Aid report

invited to attend the meeting with observer status.

A commission to study a draft convention designed to render commercial exchanges between Arab countries easier, was also established. The draft will be submitted to the Arab Economic and Social Council at its next session.

## Decline in OPEC surplus forecast

A STUDY by Chase Manhattan Bank's vice-president, Sharif Ghalib, and David H. Knapp, vice-president of the bank's energy economics group, estimates that the 1980 OPEC current account surplus will total around \$112,500 million. The project surplus is based on estimates of net oil revenues accruing to OPEC of \$286,400 million from average oil exports of 26.9 million barrels per day — excluding exports of natural gas liquids — and of investment income of \$26,300 million.

The 1980 estimated current account surpluses of OPEC members are: Libya, \$9,100 million; Saudi Arabia, \$40,400 million; Kuwait, \$16,100 million; UAE, \$12,200 million; Iraq, \$19,600 million; Iran, \$900 million; Qatar, \$3,200 million; Nigeria, \$7,200 million; Gabon, \$800 million; Indonesia, \$1,600 million; Venezuela, \$1,800 million; and Ecuador, \$500 million. The study does not project a current account surplus for Algeria.

The study predicts that the overall surplus will decline to \$85,400

million next year but Mr Ghalib stresses that this is a maximum figure, and that if OPEC imports of goods and services grow at a faster rate than assumed in the study, the combined surplus could be lower. He also stresses that several OPEC countries have recently approved, or are likely to approve, ambitious development plans, and are stepping up weapons purchases.

## Arab aid to Africa

REFUGEES IN Sudan are to receive \$600,000 in material aid from the Libyan Jamahiriya, according to Mr Muhammad Mirghani Mubarak, Sudan's Minister of State for Foreign Affairs. Sudan is currently facing problems due to the burden of supporting thousands of refugees from conflicts in neighbouring countries. News of the aid to Sudan comes hard on the heels of the announcement in late August that the Libyan Jamahiriya had sent its first shipment of aid to Uganda for use in the famine-stricken region of Karamoja. The shipment comprised a plane load of medical supplies, baby foods and blankets.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations is extremely concerned at food shortages in Africa and at a meeting called by the organisation in September nine countries, including Algeria and the United States announced new contributions of food aid for 26 African nations suffering from

shortages. The US aid administrator Mr Douglas Bennett said American food assistance to Africa would jump from 830,000 tonnes in the 1979-80 financial year to 1,340,000 tonnes in 1981 at current prices.

Algeria became the first member of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries to contribute to multilateral food aid programmes by offering a grant of \$300,000 for food aid and \$500,000 for the world emergency food reserve.

## US trade deficit with Arab states triples

INCREASED OIL prices and depressed US exports caused the American trade deficit with the Arab states almost to triple in the first six months of this year, despite a steep drop in oil imports from the region.

US Commerce Department figures show America's trade deficit with the Arab states shot up to \$9.6 billion in the first six months of 1980 from \$3.4 billion in the same period last year. US exports to the region totalled \$6.5 billion, up from \$5.2 billion in the first half of last year. Arab imports to the United States soared to \$16.1 billion from \$8.6 billion during the same period of 1979, even though the actual volume of oil purchased decreased.

US imports of crude and petroleum products from Arab states fell by roughly 16 per cent to 557.8 million barrels during the first half of this year, from 645.8 million barrels a year earlier, but sharply higher prices more than offset the decline in volume. The US trade deficit with the Arab countries widened as worldwide US oil imports plummeted 13.9 per cent in the first six months of the year because sagging domestic demand created an unwieldy surplus of US oil stocks.

The Commerce Department figures cover the Arab League states with the exception of Mauritania, Somalia, Djibouti and Palestine.

The overall trend of US trade with the Arab states is clearly represented in the figures for trade with the Libyan Jamahiriya. In the first six months of this year, the United States imported a massive \$3,767.2 million worth of goods from Libya, against US exports of only \$245.1 million, giving a US deficit of \$3,522.1 million. This was 85 per cent higher than the deficit in the first six months of 1979, when the United States imported goods worth \$2,135.9 million from Libya compared to exports of only \$227 million.

## Giant petro-chemicals complex opens


THE PETROCHEMICALS sector lies at the core of the Libyan Jamahiriya's ambitious programme of industrial development and the official opening on 30th August of the mammoth petrochemicals complex at Abu Kammash, near the Tunisian frontier, represents a major milestone in the expansion of the country's industrial capacity. Last year the industrial sector as a whole attained a growth rate of 15 per cent, primarily the result of increased production of petrochemicals, which rose from 305,000 tons in 1978 to 500,000 tons. 1979 was the first year in which the Jamahiriya exported oil-based products, with shipments totalling 195,000 tons. The new complex at Abu Kammash, together with the rapid development of petrochemical projects elsewhere in Libya, make it certain that production this year will be well up on last year's level.

The Abu Kammash complex which was constructed by a West German consortium on a 134 hectare site, is to produce annually 60,000 tonnes of plastics, 49,000 tonnes of caustic soda, 40,000 tonnes of table salt, 5,000 tonnes of liquid chlorine, 8,000 tonnes of hydrochloric acid and 8,090 tonnes of sodium hypochloride solution. The value of this annual output is estimated at LD26 million. The 1,100 workers employed at the new complex were trained overseas. Investment at the site totalled LD350 million, a figure that includes the cost of a nearby housing estate, school, post office, marketplace and mosque.

The Abu Kammash plant is one of two giant petrochemicals complexes that have been the foci of this sector's development in recent months. The other is at Ras Lanouf, on the coast of the Gulf of Sirte about midway between Benghazi and Misrata, where a giant oil refinery and an ethylene plant are under construction. Marsa Brega, on the coast about 125 kilometres east of Ras Lanouf, is also developing as an important petrochemicals centre, although none of the projects located there is on anything like the scale of the Abu Kammash or Ras Lanouf installations.

## Oil exploration gathers momentum

THREE WESTERN oil companies have agreed to invest a total of at least \$275 million in oil



The Libyan Jamahiriya pushes ahead with petro-chemical industries

exploration in the Libyan Jamahiriya. The firms are Coastal States Gas Corporation of Houston, Texas, the Royal Dutch-Shell group of Britain and the Netherlands, and the state owned Deminex Company of West Germany. Coastal States says it expects to spend \$75 million on exploration, while Shell and Deminex are each putting up at least \$100 million.

It is reported that Libya has also signed agreements in recent months with the Bulgarian and Rumanian state oil companies in a bid to minimise its dependence on western concerns. Under the new accords, technically known as exploration and production agreements, Libya's National Oil Corporation will take up to 85 per cent of any oil found. The companies will not have to pay tax or royalties on their share but they will lose their entire investment if no oil is found, according to the reports.

## Light industry production rises

OUTPUT IN light industry in the first six months of the year was valued at LD57 million, according to figures released by the Secretariat of the People's Committee for Light Industries. In most enterprises, the production was up by 120-216 per cent in real terms over the figures for the corresponding periods of last year and the year before.

Production figures for the first half of this year were: milk products, 19 million litres; flour, 110,000 tonnes; feedstuffs, 130,000 tonnes; aluminium piping, 14,000 tonnes; plastic piping, 5,200 tonnes; bricks, 40,000 tonnes; shoes, 2,012,306 pairs; skins, 1,960,000 square feet; shoe leather, 84.5 tonnes; ready

to wear men's suits, 152,000; macaroni, 55,300 tonnes; spun wool yarn, 360 tonnes; tinned foods, 18,420 tonnes; and furniture, both school and domestic, 65,250 items.

The continuing rapid growth of light industry in the Libyan Jamahiriya was underlined by the opening on 1st September of a flour mill complex near Tobruk. The complex includes five grain silos with a total storage capacity of 10,000 cubic metres and an hourly production capacity of 18,500 kilos of flour.

## Dramatic expansion in cement sector

WITH FOUR separate cement production projects announced in August, the Libyan Jamahiriya is rapidly freeing itself of dependence on foreign suppliers of this vital commodity in a country where construction activity is underway at such a feverish pace. When Planning Secretary Musa Abu Freiwa addressed the General People's Congress in Tripoli in January he was able to report that cement production in the Jamahiriya in 1979 had surpassed the previous year's level by 23 per cent. Production, he reported, had increased from 1.3 million tons to 1.6 million tons. Evidently Libya's cement output will continue its rapid rate of expansion.

A cement works inaugurated at Homs, on the coast east of Tripoli, on 28th August will have a production capacity of one million tonnes per annum. Established at a cost of LD60 million, the Homs works will employ 300 workers and make an estimated revenue of 13 million dinars per annum, according to the Libyan news agency JANA. The same day, the foundation stone of a LD52,500,000 cement factory was

laid at Zlitan. This too will have a capacity of one million tonnes per year. Three days later another cement works was inaugurated at the Zawiya oil refinery, west of Tripoli. This is a smaller project, with a production capacity of 100,000 tonnes per annum. The cement works cost LD10 million and is expected to yield an annual revenue of LD7 million.

A second production line was opened at the lime factory at the Hawari cement works in Benghazi on 25th August. The new line has a daily capacity of 100 tonnes of unslaked and 125 tonnes of slaked lime. The scheme cost LD6 million and its objective is to increase the storage capacity of the first and second production lines.

Another recent project in the construction materials sector is a tile factory opened at Gharian on 5th September. With a capacity of 8,000 tonnes of tiles per year, the factory cost LD3.5 million and employs 200 workers.

## New road construction projects

AN LD11.5 million (\$38.8 million) contract to build 193 kilometres of roads in the Aziziyah region, about 50 kilometres south of Tripoli, has been won by an international contractor, the Jamahiriya News Agency JANA has reported. The contract, awarded by the Aziziyah District People's Committee for Communications and Marine Transport, is for completion in two years.

Two other road building contracts, worth \$27.5 million, have gone to Indian Road Construction Corporation, reported *Middle East Economic Digest* on 12th September. The contracts, for 128 kilometres of roads, are also scheduled for completion in 1982.



# THE GREEN BOOK



BY MUAMMAR AL QADHAFI

## PART 1

The solution of the problem of Democracy

## PART 2

The solution of the Economic Problem

## PART 3

The Social Basis of the Third Universal Theory

In these three volumes the Libyan leader examines the economic, social and political problems confronting the world today, and presents a radical programme for their solution.

The Green Book provides a comprehensive review of the theories on which the Libyan Jamahiriya is based. The proposals put forward by Muammer al Qadhafi are not merely theories but an explanation and insight into the structure and priorities of modern Libya.

Copies of The Green Book can be obtained from The Information Department, The Libyan People's Bureau of the Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 5 St James's Square, London SW1.

# jamahiriya review

NOVEMBER 1980

Price 50p

HARVARD UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

AUG 23 1983

Islam in Africa Report



**The Moro struggle in the Philippines  
Polisario threatens Hassan's throne  
Zionism and the Palestinians**